

Remarks

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Rejections Based On Sasaki

Claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9, 11-12, 14, 16, 17 and 19 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Sasaki (5228118). Claims 8, 10, 13, 15, 18 and 20 were rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Sasaki.

Claim 1 is directed to a printing system that includes a rendering module disposed in a peripheral device. The rendering module is provided to a host device to help control the peripheral device. Claim 1 has been amended to make it clear that the peripheral device in the printing system is a printer and that the rendering module includes a printer driver. Claim 1, therefore, now recites a "rendering module disposed in a printer, said rendering module including a printer driver and said rendering module being provided to said host device in response to said communication, said first program and said rendering module used cooperatively to control said printer."

Sasaki teaches an "ID Data Output control program" residing on a laser printer LP. The control program sends "interpreter-identification data" to a personal computer PC. The interpreter-identification data identifies to the PC which of two Language Interpreters (A or B) the printer uses for interpreting printing control languages. The computer uses this identification data to select the appropriate printer driver. Sasaki, column 5, lines 32-43 and column 7, lines 44-53. Assuming for purposes of argument only that interpreter-identification data in Sasaki might somehow be deemed a rendering module, such data does not include a driver for the printer, as recited in amended Claim 1. Assuming for purposes of argument only that the Data Output control program or the Language Interpreters might somehow be deemed a rendering module, neither includes a driver for the printer and neither is provided to the host device, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Sasaki does not disclose all of the limitations of amended Claim 1 and the rejection of Claim 1 should be withdrawn. For these same reasons, the rejection of Claims 2-8 depending from Claim 1 should also be withdrawn.

Claim 9 recites a method for dynamically creating a driver that includes the host device receiving second program logic from the peripheral device and driving the peripheral device using the second program logic. Claim 14 is a programming

counterpart of the method of Claim 9, and contains similar limitations. In support of the rejection of Claims 9 and 14, the Office asserts that Sasaki's "ID Data Output control program" is the claimed second program logic. This assertion is not correct. First, Sasaki's Data Output control program is not received by the host device. Second, Sasaki's Data Output control program is not used to drive the printer alone or on cooperation with first program logic on the host device. The control program sends interpreter-identification data to a personal computer PC. The interpreter-identification data identifies to the PC which of two Language Interpreters (A or B) the printer uses for interpreting printing control languages. The computer uses this identification data to select the appropriate printer driver. Sasaki, column 5, lines 32-43 and column 7, lines 44-53. The only thing received by the host device from the printer in Sasaki is the interpreter-identification data, which is not program logic nor is it used to drive the printer.

Sasaki does not disclose all of the limitations of Claims 9 and 14. The Office, therefore, has failed to establish a prima facie case of anticipation and the rejection of Claims 9 and 14 should be withdrawn. For these same reasons, the rejection of Claims 10-13 and 15-20 depending from Claims 9 and 14, respectively, should also be withdrawn.

Rejections Based On Yu

Claims 1, 2 and 5 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Yu (6707568). Claim 6 was rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Yu. In support of the rejections, the Office asserts that filter 20 in Yu is a rendering module disposed in a peripheral device. This assertion is not correct. Filter 20 in Yu resides on computer 2 (the host device) along with printer driver 12, not on printer 6. Yu, Figs. 3A and 3B. Hence, even if it is assumed filter 20 might somehow be deemed to be the claimed rendering module, it is not disposed on the printer as recited in amended Claim 1. In addition, amended Claim 1 recites that the rendering module includes a driver for the printer. Printer driver 12 in Yu is not included in filter 20 -- they are discrete components.

Yu does not disclose all of the limitations of amended Claim 1 and the rejection of Claim 1 based on Yu should be withdrawn. For these same reasons, the rejection of Claims 2, 5 and 6 depending from Claim 1 should also be withdrawn.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the outstanding Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Ormiston', written over a horizontal line.

Steven R. Ormiston
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,974
(208) 433-1991 x204